RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 Attorney Docket No.: Q66677

Application No.: 09/981,253

REMARKS

This Amendment, filed in reply to the Office Action dated June 15, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 are all the claims pending in the application.

Substantive rejections

Claims 1 and 3 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Nakazawa, which is previously of record. Claims 2 and 4 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nakazawa in view of Tsuchino, which is previously of record. Claim 5 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nakazawa in view of Wang, which is previously of record. Claims 6-9 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nakazawa in view of Wang in further view of Tsuchino. Newly added claim 10 is rejected as being anticipated by Nakazawa.

In the response to Arguments section (ii), the Examiner again relies on the dynamic compression to teach the features of the claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner appears to be confusing the difference between the spatial frequency and the density. The term "the low spatial frequency area", which is disclosed in col. 4, line 53. col. 5, line 4 of Nakagawa, seems to point out a specific position of the image. However, "the low spatial frequency area" means the low spatial frequency component which composes the spatial frequency of the image. The spatial frequency is the frequency which is obtained by decomposing the image to a plurality of frequency ranges. On the other hand, the density is determined by the amount of the X-ray which is transmitted through the object. The spatial frequency has neither density information nor position

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 Attorney Docket No.: Q66677

Application No.: 09/981,253

information, and the density does not have the information of the spatial frequency. Therefore, there is no relationship between the spatial frequency and the density.

The Examiner cites to a number of portions of Nakazawa as allegedly teaching the claimed feature that the high density region is dynamically compressed, but the low density range is unaffected. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position. Specifically, the Examiner cites col. 12, lines 21-32 as teaching that dynamic range may be compressed by processing according to unsharp mask signals corresponding to ultra-low spatial frequency components of image signals of the original image. However, notably, the Examiner omits the word "total" before "dynamic range" in this quotation. As argued at page 6 of the March 1, 2007 Amendment, the unsharpness mask is used over the whole of the image to produce a compressed image in total, rather than only compressing the high density range as set forth by claim 1. Accordingly, to the extent the Examiner continues to rely on the dynamic range compression to teach features of claim 1, Applicant directs the Examiner to this omission, and submits that claim 1 is patentable over Nakazawa for this reason.

Independent claims 3 and 5 recite similar features to claim 1, and accordingly Applicant submits the same argument for the patentability of these claims.

Since none of the remaining art of record contain any teachings on this point, Applicant submits that the remaining claims are patentable based on their respective dependencies.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

3

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 Attorney Docket No.: Q66677

Application No.: 09/981,253

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 41,239

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060 Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 15, 2007